

Termination of λ -calculus with an extra call-by-value rule

Stéphane Lengrand^{1,2}

¹CNRS, Ecole Polytechnique, France

²University of St Andrews, Scotland

Lengrand@LIX.Polytechnique.fr

26th November 2007

Notations and standard results are presented in Appendix A.
We consider the following rule in λ -calculus:

$$\text{assoc} \quad (x.M) ((y.N) P) \longrightarrow (y.(x.M) N) P$$

We want to prove

Proposition 1 $SN^\beta \subseteq SN^{\text{assoc}\beta}$.

Lemma 1 $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}$ is terminating in λ -calculus.

Proof: Each application of the rule decreases by one the number of pairs of λ that are not nested. $\square$

To prove Proposition 1 above, it would thus be sufficient to prove that $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}$ could be adjourned with respect to $\longrightarrow_\beta$, in other words that $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}} \cdot \longrightarrow_\beta \subseteq \longrightarrow_\beta \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}\beta}^*$ (the adjournment technique leads directly to the desired strong normalisation result). When trying to prove the property by induction and case analysis on the β -reduction following the assoc -reduction to be adjourned, all cases allow the adjournment but one, namely:

$$(x.M) ((y.N) P) \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}} (y.(x.M) N) P \longrightarrow_\beta (y. \{\frac{N}{x}\} M) P$$

Hence, we shall assume without loss of generality that the β -reduction is not of the above kind. For that we need to identify a sub-relation of β -reduction $\hookrightarrow$ such that

- $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}$ can now be adjourned with respect to $\hookrightarrow$
- we can justify that there is no loss of generality.

For this we give ourselves the possibility of marking λ -redexes and forbid reductions under their (marked) bindings, so that, if in the assoc -reduction above we make sure that $(y.(x.M) N) P$ is marked, the problematic β -reduction is forbidden.

Hence we use the usual notation for a marked redex $(y.Q) P$, but we can also see it as the construct $\text{let } y = P \text{ in } Q$ of c [Mog88] and other works on call-by-value λ -calculus. We start with a reminder about marked redexes.

Definition 1 The syntax of the λ -calculus is extended as follows:

$$M, N ::= x \mid x.M \mid M N \mid (\bar{\lambda}x.M) N$$

Reduction is given by the following system β_{12} :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \beta_1 & (x.M) N \longrightarrow \{M/x\} N \\ \beta_2 & (\bar{\lambda}x.M) N \longrightarrow \{M/x\} N \end{array}$$

The forgetful projection onto λ -calculus is straightforward:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \phi(x) & := x \\ \phi(x.M) & := x.\phi(M) \\ \phi(M N) & := \phi(M) \phi(N) \\ \phi((\bar{\lambda}x.M) N) & := (x.\phi(M)) \phi(N) \end{array}$$

Remark 2 Clearly, $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}}$ strongly simulates $\longrightarrow_{\beta}$ through ϕ^{-1} and $\longrightarrow_{\beta}$ strongly simulates $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}}$ through ϕ .

Reducing under $\bar{\lambda}$ and erasing $\bar{\lambda}$ can be strongly adjointed

In this section we identify the reduction notion $\hookrightarrow (\subseteq \longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}})$ and we argue against the loss of generality by proving that $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}} \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot (\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}} \cup \hookrightarrow)^+$, a strong case of adjournment, presented in Appendix B, whose direct corollary is that, for every sequence of β_{12} -reduction, there is also a sequence of $\hookrightarrow$ -reduction of the same length and starting from the same term.

We thus split the reduction system β_{12} into two cases depending on whether or not a reduction throws away an argument that contains some markings:

Definition 2

$$\begin{array}{l} \beta_{\kappa} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (x.M) P \longrightarrow M & \text{if } x \notin \text{FV}(M) \text{ and there is a term } (\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq P \\ (\bar{\lambda}x.M) P \longrightarrow M & \text{if } x \notin \text{FV}(M) \text{ and there is a term } (\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq P \end{array} \right. \\ \beta_{\bar{\kappa}} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (x.M) P \longrightarrow M & \text{if } x \in \text{FV}(M) \text{ or there is no term } (\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq P \\ (\bar{\lambda}x.M) P \longrightarrow M & \text{if } x \in \text{FV}(M) \text{ or there is no term } (\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq P \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

Remark 3 Clearly, $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}} = \longrightarrow_{\beta_{\kappa}} \cup \longrightarrow_{\beta_{\bar{\kappa}}}$.

No we distinguish whether or not a reduction occurs underneath a marked redex, via the following rule and the following notion of contextual closure:

Definition 3

$$\bar{\beta} \quad (\bar{\lambda}x.M) P \longrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P \quad \text{if } M \longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}} N$$

Now we define a weak notion of contextual closure for a rewriting system i :

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{i : M \longrightarrow N}{M \rightharpoonup_i N} \quad \frac{M \rightharpoonup_i N}{x.M \rightharpoonup_i x.N} \quad \frac{M \rightharpoonup_i N}{M P \rightharpoonup_i N P} \quad \frac{M \rightharpoonup_i N}{P M \rightharpoonup_i P N} \\[10pt] \frac{M \rightharpoonup_i N}{(\bar{\lambda}x.P) M \rightharpoonup_i (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N} \end{array}$$

Finally we use the following abbreviations:

Definition 4 Let $\hookrightarrow := \rightharpoonup_{\beta_{\bar{\kappa}}}$ and $\rightsquigarrow_1 := \rightharpoonup_{\beta_{\kappa}}$ and $\rightsquigarrow_2 := \rightharpoonup_{\bar{\beta}}$.

Remark 4 Clearly, $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}} = \hookrightarrow \cup \rightsquigarrow_1 \cup \rightsquigarrow_2$.

Lemma 5 If $(\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq P$, then there is P' such that $P \hookrightarrow P'$.

Proof: By induction on P

- The case $P = y$ is vacuous.
- For $P = y.M$, we have $(\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq M$ and the induction hypothesis provides $M \hookrightarrow M'$, so $y.M \hookrightarrow y.M'$.
- For $P = M_1 M_2$, we have either $(\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq M_1$ or $(\bar{\lambda}x.N) Q \sqsubseteq M_2$. In the former case the induction hypothesis provides $M_1 \hookrightarrow M'_1$, so $M_1 M_2 \hookrightarrow M'_1 M_2$. The latter case is similar.
- Suppose $P = (\bar{\lambda}y.M_1) M_2$. If there is a term $(\bar{\lambda}x'.N') Q' \sqsubseteq M_2$, the induction hypothesis provides $M_2 \hookrightarrow M'_2$, so $(\bar{\lambda}y.M_1) M_2 \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}y.M_1) M'_2$. If there is no such term $(\bar{\lambda}x'.N') Q' \sqsubseteq M_2$, we have $(\bar{\lambda}y.M_1) M_2 \hookrightarrow \{M_2/y\} M_1$.

□

Lemma 6 $\leadsto_1 \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \leadsto_1$

Proof: By induction on the reduction step $\leadsto_1$.

For the base cases $(x.M) P \longrightarrow_{\beta\kappa} M$ or $(\bar{\lambda}x.M) P \longrightarrow_{\beta\kappa} M$ with $x \notin \text{FV}(M)$ and $(\bar{\lambda}y.N) Q \sqsubseteq P$, Lemma 5 provides the reduction $P \hookrightarrow P'$, so $(x.M) P \hookrightarrow (x.M) P' \leadsto_1 M$ and $(\bar{\lambda}x.M) P \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.M) P' \leadsto_1 M$.

The induction step is straightforward as the same contextual closure is used on both sides (namely, the weak one). □

Lemma 7 $\leadsto_2 \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}}^+$

Proof: By induction on the reduction step $\hookrightarrow$. See appendix C. □

Corollary 8 $\longrightarrow_{\beta_{12}}$ can be strongly adjourned with respect to $\hookrightarrow$.

Proof: Straightforward from the last two theorems, and Remark 4. □

assoc-reduction

We introduce two new rules in the marked λ -calculus to simulate **assoc**:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \overline{\text{assoc}} & (\bar{\lambda}x.M) (\bar{\lambda}y.N) P & \longrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}y.(\bar{\lambda}x.M) N) P \\ \text{act} & (x.M) N & \longrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.M) N \end{array}$$

Remark 9 Clearly, $\longrightarrow_{\overline{\text{assoc}}\text{act}}$ strongly simulates $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}$ through ϕ^{-1} .

Notice that with the $\text{let} = \text{in}$ -notation, $\overline{\text{assoc}}$ and act are simply the rules of c

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \overline{\text{assoc}} & \text{let } x = (\text{let } y = P \text{ in } N) \text{ in } M & \longrightarrow \text{let } y = P \text{ in let } x = N \text{ in } M \\ \text{act} & (x.M) N & \longrightarrow \text{let } x = N \text{ in } M \end{array}$$

Lemma 10 $\longrightarrow_{\overline{\text{assoc}}\text{act}} \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\overline{\text{assoc}}\text{act}}^*$

Proof: By induction on the reduction step $\hookrightarrow$. See appendix C. □

Lemma 11 $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$ can be strongly adjourned with respect to $\hookrightarrow$.

Proof: We prove that $\forall k, \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^k \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12} \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$ by induction on k .

- For $k = 0$, this is Corollary 8.
- Suppose it is true for k . By the induction hypothesis we get

$$\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}} \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^k \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12} \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}} \cdot \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$$

Then by Lemma 10 we get

$$\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}} \cdot \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12} \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}} \cdot \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$$

□

Remark 12 Note from Lemma 5 that $\text{nf}^{\hookrightarrow} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\hookrightarrow_1 \cup \hookrightarrow_2} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\longrightarrow_{\beta 12}} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}}$.

Theorem 13 $\text{BN}^{\hookrightarrow} \subseteq \text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}}$

Proof: We apply Theorem 28, since $\text{nf}^{\hookrightarrow} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}}$ and clearly

$$(\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}) \cup \hookrightarrow = \longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$$

□

Theorem 14 $\text{BN}^{\beta} \subseteq \text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}}$

Proof: Since $\longrightarrow_{\beta}$ strongly simulates $\hookrightarrow$ through ϕ , we have $\phi^{-1}(\text{BN}^{\beta}) \subseteq \text{BN}^{\hookrightarrow} \subseteq \text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}}$. Hence $\phi(\phi^{-1}(\text{BN}^{\beta})) \subseteq \phi(\text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}})$. Since ϕ is surjective, $\text{BN}^{\beta} = \phi(\phi^{-1}(\text{BN}^{\beta}))$. Hence $\text{BN}^{\beta} \subseteq \phi(\text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}})$. Also, $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}$ strongly simulates $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}$ through ϕ^{-1} , so $\phi(\text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}, \text{act}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}}) \subseteq \text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}}$. □

Theorem 15 $\text{SN}^{\beta} \subseteq \text{SN}^{\text{assoc}\beta}$

Proof: First, from Lemma 19, $\text{BN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}} \subseteq \text{SN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}}$. Then from Lemma 1, $\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}$ is terminating and hence SN^{assoc} is stable under $\longrightarrow_{\beta}$. Hence we can apply Lemma 24 to get $\text{SN}^{\text{assoc}\beta} = \text{SN}^{\longrightarrow_{\text{assoc}}^* \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta}}$. From the previous theorem we thus have $\text{BN}^{\beta} \subseteq \text{SN}^{\text{assoc}\beta}$. Now, noticing that β -reduction in λ -calculus is finitely branching, Lemma 18 gives $\text{BN}^{\beta} = \text{SN}^{\beta}$ and thus $\text{SN}^{\beta} \subseteq \text{SN}^{\text{assoc}\beta}$. □

References

- [Mog88] E. Moggi. Computational lambda-calculus and monads. Report ECS-LFCS-88-66, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, October 1988.

A Reminder: Notations, Definitions and Basic Results

Definition 5 (Relations)

- We denote the composition of relations by $\cdot$, the identity relation by Id , and the inverse of a relation by $^{-1}$.
- If $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we write $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D})$ for $\{M \in \mathcal{B} \mid \exists N \in \mathcal{D}, N \mathcal{R} M\}$, or equivalently $\bigcup_{N \in \mathcal{D}} \{M \in \mathcal{B} \mid N \mathcal{R} M\}$. When $\mathcal{D}$ is the singleton $\{M\}$, we write $\mathcal{R}(M)$ for $\mathcal{R}(\{M\})$.
- We say that a relation $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is *total* if $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 16 Composition is associative, and identity relations are neutral for the composition operation.

Definition 6 (Reduction relation)

- A *reduction relation* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a relation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}$.
- Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$, we define the set of $\rightarrow$ -*reducible forms* (or just *reducible forms* when the relation is clear) as $\text{rf}^\rightarrow := \{M \in \mathcal{A} \mid \exists N \in \mathcal{A}, M \rightarrow N\}$. We define the set of *normal forms* as $\text{nf}^\rightarrow := \{M \in \mathcal{A} \mid \nexists N \in \mathcal{A}, M \rightarrow N\}$.
- Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$, we write $\leftarrow$ for $\rightarrow^{-1}$, and we define $\rightarrow^n$ by induction on the natural number n as follows:
 $\rightarrow^0 := \text{Id}$
 $\rightarrow^{n+1} := \rightarrow \cdot \rightarrow^n (= \rightarrow^n \cdot \rightarrow)$
 $\rightarrow^+$ denotes the transitive closure of $\rightarrow$ (i.e. $\rightarrow^+ := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \rightarrow^n$).
 $\rightarrow^*$ denotes the transitive and reflexive closure of $\rightarrow$ (i.e. $\rightarrow^* := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \rightarrow^n$).
 $\leftrightarrow$ denotes the symmetric closure of $\rightarrow$ (i.e. $\leftrightarrow := \leftarrow \cup \rightarrow$).
 $\leftrightarrow^*$ denotes the transitive, reflexive and symmetric closure of $\rightarrow$.
- An *equivalence relation* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a transitive, reflexive and symmetric reduction relation on $\mathcal{A}$, i.e. a relation $\rightarrow = \leftrightarrow^*$, hence denoted more often by $\sim, \equiv, \dots$
- Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$ and a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, the *closure of $\mathcal{B}$ under $\rightarrow$* is $\rightarrow^*(\mathcal{B})$.

Definition 7 (Finitely branching relation) A reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$ is *finitely branching* if $\forall M \in \mathcal{A}, \rightarrow(M)$ is finite.

Definition 8 (Stability) Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$, we say that a subset $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\rightarrow$ -*stable* (or *stable under $\rightarrow$*) if $\rightarrow(\mathcal{T}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$.

Definition 9 (Strong simulation)

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a relation between two sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively equipped with the reduction relations $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$.

$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ *strongly simulates* $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ *through $\mathcal{R}$* if $(\mathcal{R}^{-1} \cdot \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}) \subseteq (\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^+ \cdot \mathcal{R}^{-1})$.

Remark 17

1. If $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, and if $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \rightarrow'_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\rightarrow'_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$, then $\rightarrow'_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow'_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$.

2. If $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\rightarrow'_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, then it also strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot \rightarrow'_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$.
3. Hence, if $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, then it also strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ through $\mathcal{R}$.

Definition 10 (Patriarchal) Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$, we say that

- a subset $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is $\rightarrow$ -*patriarchal* (or just *patriarchal* when the relation is clear) if $\forall N \in \mathcal{A}, \rightarrow(N) \subseteq \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow N \in \mathcal{T}$.
- a predicate P on $\mathcal{A}$ is *patriarchal* if $\{M \in \mathcal{A} \mid P(M)\}$ is *patriarchal*.

Definition 11 (Normalising elements) Given a reduction relation $\rightarrow$ on $\mathcal{A}$, the set of $\rightarrow$ -*strongly normalising* elements is

$$SN^{\rightarrow} := \bigcap_{\mathcal{T} \text{ is patriarchal}} \mathcal{T}$$

Definition 12 (Bounded elements) The set of $\rightarrow$ -*bounded* elements is defined as

$$BN^{\rightarrow} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} BN_n^{\rightarrow}$$

where $BN_n^{\rightarrow}$ is defined by induction on the natural number n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} BN_0^{\rightarrow} &:= nf^{\rightarrow} \\ BN_{n+1}^{\rightarrow} &:= \{M \in \mathcal{A} \mid \exists n' \leq n, \rightarrow(M) \subseteq BN_{n'}^{\rightarrow}\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 18 *If $\rightarrow$ is finitely branching, then $BN^{\rightarrow}$ is patriarchal. As a consequence, $BN^{\rightarrow} = SN^{\rightarrow}$.*

Lemma 19

1. If $n < n'$ then $BN_n^{\rightarrow} \subseteq BN_{n'}^{\rightarrow} \subseteq BN^{\rightarrow}$. In particular, $nf^{\rightarrow} \subseteq BN_n^{\rightarrow} \subseteq BN^{\rightarrow}$.
2. $BN^{\rightarrow} \subseteq SN^{\rightarrow}$.

Lemma 20

1. $SN^{\rightarrow}$ is patriarchal.
2. If $M \in BN^{\rightarrow}$ then $\rightarrow(M) \subseteq BN^{\rightarrow}$.
If $M \in SN^{\rightarrow}$ then $\rightarrow(M) \subseteq SN^{\rightarrow}$.

Theorem 21 (Induction principle) *Given a predicate P on $\mathcal{A}$, suppose $\forall M \in SN^{\rightarrow}, (\forall N \in \rightarrow(M), P(N)) \Rightarrow P(M)$. Then $\forall M \in SN^{\rightarrow}, P(M)$.*

When we use this theorem to prove a statement $P(M)$ for all M in $SN^{\rightarrow}$, we just add $(\forall N \in \rightarrow(M), P(N))$ to the assumptions, which we call the induction hypothesis.

We say that we prove the statement by induction in $SN^{\rightarrow}$.

Lemma 22

1. If $\rightarrow_1 \subseteq \rightarrow_2$, then $nf^{\rightarrow_1} \supseteq nf^{\rightarrow_2}$, $SN^{\rightarrow_1} \supseteq SN^{\rightarrow_2}$,
and for all n , $BN_n^{\rightarrow_1} \supseteq BN_n^{\rightarrow_2}$.

2. $\text{nf}^\rightarrow = \text{nf}^{\rightarrow^+}$, $\text{SN}^\rightarrow = \text{SN}^{\rightarrow^+}$, and for all n , $\text{BN}_n^{\rightarrow^+} = \text{BN}_n^\rightarrow$.

Notice that this result enables us to use a stronger induction principle: in order to prove $\forall M \in \text{SN}^\rightarrow, P(M)$, it now suffices to prove

$$\forall M \in \text{SN}^\rightarrow, (\forall N \in \rightarrow^+(M), P(N)) \Rightarrow P(M)$$

This induction principle is called the *transitive induction in $\text{SN}^\rightarrow$* .

Theorem 23 (Strong normalisation by strong simulation) *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a relation between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, equipped with the reduction relations $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

If $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, then $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\text{SN}^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}}) \subseteq \text{SN}^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}}$.

Lemma 24 *Given two reduction relations $\rightarrow_1, \rightarrow_2$, suppose that $\text{SN}^{\rightarrow_1}$ is stable under $\rightarrow_2$. Then $\text{SN}^{\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2} = \text{SN}^{\rightarrow_1^* \rightarrow_2} \cap \text{SN}^{\rightarrow_1}$.*

B Strong adjournment

Definition 13 Suppose $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{A}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{R}$ is a relation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.

$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ *simulates the reduction lengths of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$* if

$$\forall k, \forall M, N \in \mathcal{A}, \forall P \in \mathcal{B}, M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^k N \wedge M \mathcal{R} P \Rightarrow \exists Q \in \mathcal{B}, P \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^k Q$$

Lemma 25 *Suppose $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{A}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{R}$ is a relation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.*

If $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ strongly simulates $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, then $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ simulates the reduction lengths of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$.

Proof: We prove by induction on k that $\forall k, \forall M, N \in \mathcal{A}^2, \forall P \in \mathcal{B}, M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^k N \wedge M \mathcal{R} P \Rightarrow \exists Q, P \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^k Q$.

- For $k = 0$: take $Q := M = N$.
- Suppose it is true for k and take $M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}} M' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^k N$. The strong simulation gives P' such that $P \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^+ P'$ and $M' \mathcal{R} P'$. The induction hypothesis gives Q' such that $P' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^k Q'$. Then it suffices to take the prefix $P \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^{k+1} Q$ (of length $k+1$) of $P \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^+ P' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^k Q'$.

□

Lemma 26 $\forall n, \forall M, (\forall k, \forall N, M \rightarrow^k N \Rightarrow k \leq n) \iff M \in \text{BN}_n^\rightarrow$

Proof: By transitive induction on n .

- For $n = 0$: clearly both sides are equivalent to $M \in \text{nf}^\rightarrow$.
- Suppose it is true for all $i \leq n$.
Suppose $\forall k, \forall N, M \rightarrow^k N \Rightarrow k \leq n+1$. Then take $M \rightarrow M'$ and assume $M' \rightarrow^{k'} N'$. We have $M \rightarrow^{k'+1} N'$ so from the hypothesis we derive $k' + 1 \leq n+1$, i.e. $k' \leq n$. We apply the induction hypothesis on M' and get $M' \in \text{BN}_n^\rightarrow$. By definition of $\text{BN}_{n+1}^\rightarrow$ we get $M \in \text{BN}_{n+1}^\rightarrow$.
Conversely, suppose $M \in \text{BN}_{n+1}^\rightarrow$ and $M \rightarrow^k N$. We must prove that $k \leq n+1$. If $k = 0$ we are done. If $k = k' + 1$ we have $M \rightarrow M' \rightarrow^{k'} N$; by definition of $\text{BN}_{n+1}^\rightarrow$ there is $i \leq n$ such that $M' \in \text{BN}_i^\rightarrow$, and by induction hypothesis we have $k' \leq i$; hence $k = k' + 1 \leq i + 1 \leq n + 1$.

□

Theorem 27 Suppose $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{A}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a reduction relation on $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{R}$ is a relation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.

If $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ simulates the reduction lengths of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}$ through $\mathcal{R}$, then

$$\forall n, \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathcal{B}N_n^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}N_n^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}} \quad (\subseteq \mathcal{S}N^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}})$$

Proof: Suppose $N \in \mathcal{B}N_n^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}}$ and $M\mathcal{R}N$. If $M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^k M'$ then by simulation $N \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^k N'$ so by Lemma 26 we have $k \leq n$. Hence by (the other direction of) Lemma 26 we have $M \in \mathcal{B}N_n^{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}}$. $\square$

Definition 14 Let $\rightarrow_1$ and $\rightarrow_2$ be two reduction relations on $\mathcal{A}$.

The relation $\rightarrow_1$ can be *strongly adjourned with respect to* $\rightarrow_2$ if

whenever $M \rightarrow_1 N \rightarrow_2 P$ there exists Q such that $M \rightarrow_2 Q(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^+ P$.

Theorem 28 Let $\rightarrow_1$ and $\rightarrow_2$ be two reduction relations on $\mathcal{A}$. If $\text{nf}^{\rightarrow_2} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\rightarrow_1}$ and $\rightarrow_1$ can be strongly adjourned with respect to $\rightarrow_2$ then $\mathcal{B}N^{\rightarrow_2} \subseteq \mathcal{B}N^{\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2}$.

Proof: From Theorem 27, it suffices to show that $\rightarrow_2$ simulates the reduction lengths of $\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2$ through the identity. We show by induction on k that

$$\forall k, \forall M, N, M(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^k N \Rightarrow \exists Q, M \rightarrow_2^k Q$$

- For $k = 0$: take $Q := M$
- For $k = 1$: If $M \rightarrow_2 N$ take $Q := N$; if $M \rightarrow_1 N$ use the hypothesis $\text{nf}^{\rightarrow_2} \subseteq \text{nf}^{\rightarrow_1}$ to produce Q such that $M \rightarrow_2 Q$.
- Suppose it is true for $k + 1$ and take $M(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)P(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^{k+1}N$.

The induction hypothesis provides T such that $P \rightarrow_2^{k+1} T$, in other words $P \rightarrow_2 S \rightarrow_2^k T$.

If $M \rightarrow_2 P$ we are done. If $M \rightarrow_1 P$ we use the hypothesis of adjournment to transform $M \rightarrow_1 P \rightarrow_2 S$ into $M \rightarrow_2 P'(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^+ S$. Take the prefix $P'(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^{k+1}R$ (of length $k + 1$) of $P'(\rightarrow_1 \cup \rightarrow_2)^+ S \rightarrow_2^k T$, and apply on this prefix the induction hypothesis to get $P' \rightarrow_2^{k+1} R$. We thus get $M \rightarrow_2^{k+2} R$.

$\square$

C Proofs

Lemma 7 $\leadsto_2 \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}^+$

Proof: By induction on the reduction step $\hookrightarrow$.

- For the base case where the $\beta\bar{\kappa}$ -reduction is a $\beta 2$ -reduction, we have $M \leadsto_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N$ with $x \in \text{FV}(N)$ or P has no marked redex as a subterm. We do a case analysis on the reduction step $M \leadsto_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$.

If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.N') P \leadsto_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$ because $N' \longrightarrow_{\beta 12} N$ then $(\bar{\lambda}x.N') P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N' \longrightarrow_{\beta 12} \{P/x\}N$.

If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P' \leadsto_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$ because $P' \leadsto_2 P$, then it means that P has a marked redex as a subterm, so we must have $x \in \text{FV}(N)$. Hence $(\bar{\lambda}x.N) P' \hookrightarrow \{P'/x\}N \longrightarrow_{\beta 12}^+ \{P/x\}N$.

- For the base case where the $\beta\bar{\kappa}$ -reduction is a $\beta 1$ -reduction, we have $M \rightsquigarrow_2 (x.N) P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N$ with $x \in \text{FV}(N)$ or P has no marked redex as a subterm. We do a case analysis on the reduction step $M \rightsquigarrow_2 (x.N) P$.
 If $M = M' P \rightsquigarrow_2 (x.N) P$ because $M' \rightsquigarrow_2 x.N$ then M' must be of the form $x.M''$ with $M'' \rightsquigarrow_2 N$. Then $(x.M'') P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}M''$ (in case P has a marked subterm, notice that $x \in \text{FV}(N) \subseteq \text{FV}(M'')$), and $\{P/x\}M'' \rightarrow_{\beta 12} \{P/x\}N$.
 If $M = (x.N) P' \rightsquigarrow_2 (x.N) P$ because $P' \rightsquigarrow_2 P$, then it means that P has a marked redex as a subterm, so we must have $x \in \text{FV}(N)$. Hence $(x.N) P' \hookrightarrow \{P'/x\}N \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} \{P/x\}N$.
- The closure under λ is straightforward.
- For the closure under application, left-hand side, we have $M \rightsquigarrow_2 N P \hookrightarrow N' P$ with $N \hookrightarrow N'$. We do a case analysis on the reduction step $M \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$.
 If $M = M' P \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$ with $M' \rightsquigarrow_2 N$, the induction hypothesis gives $M' \hookrightarrow \cdot \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} N'$ and the weak contextual closure gives $M' P \hookrightarrow \cdot \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} N' P$.
 If $M = N P' \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$ with $P' \rightsquigarrow_2 P$, we can also derive $N P' \hookrightarrow N' P' \rightarrow_{\beta 12} N' P$.
- For the closure under application, right-hand side, we have $M \rightsquigarrow_2 N P \hookrightarrow N P'$ with $P \hookrightarrow P'$. We do a case analysis on the reduction step $M \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$.
 If $M = M' P \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$ with $M' \rightsquigarrow_2 N$, we can also derive $M' P \hookrightarrow M' P' \rightarrow_{\beta 12} N P'$.
 If $M = N M' \rightsquigarrow_2 N P$ with $M' \rightsquigarrow_2 P$, the induction hypothesis gives $M' \hookrightarrow \cdot \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} P'$ and the weak contextual closure gives $N M' \hookrightarrow \cdot \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} N P'$.
- For the closure under marked redex we have $M \rightsquigarrow_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N'$ with $N \hookrightarrow N'$. We do a case analysis on the reduction step $M \rightsquigarrow_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N$.
 If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.P') N \rightsquigarrow_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N$ because $P' \rightarrow_{\beta 12} P$, we can also derive $(\bar{\lambda}x.P') N \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.P') N' \rightarrow_{\beta 12} (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N'$.
 If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.P) M' \rightsquigarrow_2 (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N$ with $M' \rightsquigarrow_2 N$, the induction hypothesis gives $M' \hookrightarrow Q \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} N'$ and the weak contextual closure gives $(\bar{\lambda}x.P) M' \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.P) Q \xrightarrow{+}_{\beta 12} (\bar{\lambda}x.P) N'$.

□

Lemma 10 $\xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} \cdot \hookrightarrow \subseteq \hookrightarrow \cdot \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{assocact}}$

Proof: By induction on the reduction step $\hookrightarrow$.

- For the first base case, we have $M \xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} (x.N) P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N$ with $x \in \text{FV}(N)$ or P has no marked subterm. Since root assocact -reduction produces neither λ -abstractions nor applications at the root, note that M has to be of the form $(x.N') P'$, with either $N' \xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} N$ (and $P' = P$) or $P' \xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} P$ (and $N' = N$). In both cases, $x \in \text{FV}(N) \subseteq \text{FV}(N')$ or P' has no marked subterm, so we also have $(x.N') P' \hookrightarrow \{P'/x\}N' \xrightarrow{*}_{\text{assocact}} \{P/x\}N$.
- For the second base case, we have $M \xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N$ with $x \in \text{FV}(N)$ or P has no marked subterm. We do a case analysis on $M \xrightarrow{\text{assocact}} (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$.
 If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x'.M_1) (\bar{\lambda}x.M_2) P \xrightarrow{\text{assoc}} (\bar{\lambda}x.(\bar{\lambda}x'.M_1) M_2) P$ with $N = (\bar{\lambda}x'.M_1) M_2$, we also have $M = (\bar{\lambda}x'.M_1) (\bar{\lambda}x.M_2) P \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x'.M_1) \{P/x\}M_2 = \{P/x\}N$.

If $M = (x.N) P \rightarrow_{\text{act}} (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$ then $M \hookrightarrow \{P/x\}N$.

If $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.N') P' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} (\bar{\lambda}x.N) P$ with either $N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} N$ (and $P' = P$) or $P' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} P$ (and $N' = N$), we have, in both cases, $x \in \text{FV}(N) \subseteq \text{FV}(N')$ or P' has no marked subterm, so we also have $(x.N') P' \hookrightarrow \{P'/x\}N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}}^* \{P/x\}N$.

- The closure under $\hookrightarrow$ is straightforward.
- For the closure under application, left-hand side, we have $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N \hookrightarrow M' N$ with $M \hookrightarrow M'$. We do a case analysis on $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$.
 If $Q = M'' N \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$ with $M'' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M$, the induction hypothesis provides $M'' \hookrightarrow \cdot \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}}^* M'$ so $M'' N \hookrightarrow \cdot \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}}^* M' N$.
 If $Q = M N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$ with $N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} N$, we also have $M N' \hookrightarrow M' N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M' N$.
- For the closure under application, right-hand side, we have $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N \hookrightarrow M N'$ with $N \hookrightarrow N'$. We do a case analysis on $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$.
 If $Q = M' N \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$ with $M' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M$, we also have $M' N \hookrightarrow M' N' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N'$.
 If $Q = M N'' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} M N$ with $N'' \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} N$, the induction hypothesis provides $N'' \hookrightarrow \cdot \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}}^* N'$ so $M N'' \hookrightarrow \cdot \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}}^* M N'$.
- For the closure under marked redex, the $\hookrightarrow$ -reduction can only come from the right-hand side because of the weak contextual closure ($\hookrightarrow$ does not reduce under $\bar{\lambda}$), so we have $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} (\bar{\lambda}y.M) P \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}y.M) P'$ with $P \hookrightarrow P'$. We do a case analysis on $Q \rightarrow_{\text{assocact}} (\bar{\lambda}y.M) P$.
 If $Q = (\bar{\lambda}x.M') (\bar{\lambda}y.N) P \rightarrow_{\text{assoc}} (\bar{\lambda}y.(\bar{\lambda}x.M') N) P$ with $M = (\bar{\lambda}x.M') N$, we also have $Q = (\bar{\lambda}x.M') (\bar{\lambda}y.N) P \hookrightarrow (\bar{\lambda}x.M') (\bar{\lambda}y.N) P' \rightarrow_{\text{assoc}} (\bar{\lambda}y.(\bar{\lambda}x.M') N) P'$.
 If $Q = (y.M) P \rightarrow_{\text{act}} (\bar{\lambda}y.M) P$, then we also have $Q = (y.M) P \hookrightarrow (y.M) P' \rightarrow_{\text{act}} (\bar{\lambda}y.M) P'$.

□